

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JESSICA KING,  
Plaintiff,  
v.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS  
COMMISSION, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [3:24-cv-03397-JD](#)

**ORDER RE DISMISSAL**

Pro se plaintiff Jessica King sued the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, Meta Platforms, NVIDIA Corporation, Maxar Technologies, Google, Secutus Technologies, Via Path/Global Tel-Link, Inter Active Corporate, Match Group, Bumble, and Meet Group. The magistrate judge originally assigned to the case granted King leave to proceed in forma pauperis, Dkt. No. 6, which moots her subsequent IFP request, Dkt. No. 15. The magistrate judge also reviewed the complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), and dismissed it as frivolous, with leave to amend. Dkt. No. 7. After that, the Clerk of the Court directed King to consent to or decline magistrate judge jurisdiction. Dkt. No. 8. King declined, and the case was re-assigned to this Court. Dkt. Nos. 9, 12.

King filed a document that the Court construes as an amended complaint. Dkt. No. 14. The Court reviewed the amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), which applies the same standards as under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). *Nordin v. Scott*, No. 3:21-CV-04717-JD, 2021 WL 4710697 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 8, 2021), *aff'd*, No. 22-15816, 2023 WL 4418595 (9th Cir. July 10, 2023). The review was liberal in light of King's pro se status, but the amended complaint still must satisfy the requirements of Rule 8 and state facts sufficient to allege a

1 plausible claim. *Nguyen Gardner v. Chevron Capital Corp.*, No. 15-cv-01514-JD, 2015 WL  
2 12976114, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 27, 2015).

3 The amended complaint is dismissed with prejudice. Much like the original complaint, it  
4 is a largely unintelligible series of statements about purported surveillance and similar conduct by  
5 tech companies. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. No. 14 at 4 (Meta engaged in a “‘Military Base’ operation which  
6 illegally revolved around the Plaintiff since she was young”). Nothing in the amended complaint  
7 comes close to plausibly alleging a claim.

8 King was afforded an opportunity to amend after an order that explained the shortcomings  
9 of the original complaint. The record indicates that further amendment will not result in a  
10 cognizable complaint. Consequently, the case is closed. No further filings by King will be  
11 accepted.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13 Dated: August 22, 2024

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES DONATO  
United States District Judge